

EXHIBIT 1

SUMMARY OF DONDERO AND RELATED ENTITY LITIGATION*

In re Highland Capital Management, L.P., Case No. 19-34054-sgj11 (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)

9/23/20 **Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with (a) Acis Capital Management, L.P. and Acis Capital Management GP LLC (Claim No. 23), (b) Joshua N. Terry and Jennifer G. Terry (Claim No. 156), and (c) Acis Capital Management, L.P. (Claim No. 159) and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith [D.I. 1087]**

Objectors:	Dondero [D.I. 1121]	Acis filed a claim for at least \$75 million. Acis claim was the result of an involuntary bankruptcy initiated when the Debtor refused to pay an arbitration award and instead transferred assets to become judgment proof. Debtor settled claim for an allowed Class 8 claim of \$23 million and approximately \$1 million in cash payments. Dondero objected to the settlement alleging that it was unreasonable and constituted vote buying.	The Acis Settlement Motion was approved and Dondero's objection was overruled [D.I. 1302].	Dondero appealed [D.I. 1347]. The appeal has been briefed and the decision is pending.
-------------------	------------------------	---	--	--

11/18/20 **Motion of the Debtor Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105(a) and 363(b) for Authority to Enter into Sub-Servicer Agreements [D.I. 1424]**

Objectors:	Dondero [D.I. 1447]	The Debtor filed a motion seeking to retain a sub-servicer to assist in its reorganization consistent with the proposed plan. Dondero alleged that the sub-servicer was not needed; was too expensive; and would not be subject to Bankruptcy Court jurisdiction [D.I. 1447].	Dondero withdrew his objection [D.I. 1460] after forcing the Debtor to incur costs responding [D.I. 1459]	N/A
-------------------	------------------------	---	---	-----

11/19/20 **James Dondero's Motion for Entry of an Order Requiring Notice and Hearing for Future Estate Transactions Occurring Outside of the Ordinary Course [D.I. 1439]**

Movant:	Dondero	Dondero alleged the Debtor sold significant assets in violation of 11 U.S.C. § 363 and without providing Dondero a chance to bid. Dondero requested an emergency hearing on this motion [D.I. 1443]. Dondero filed this motion despite having agreed to the Protocols governing such sales.	Dondero withdrew this motion [D.I. 1622] after the Debtor and the Committee were forced to incur costs responding and preparing for trial [D.I. 1546, 1551].	N/A
----------------	---------	---	--	-----

12/8/20 **Motion for Order Imposing Temporary Restrictions on Debtor's Ability, as Portfolio Manager, to Initiate Sales by Non-Debtor CLO Vehicles [D.I. 1522]**

Movants:	Advisors Funds	Movants argued that the Debtor should be precluded from causing the CLOs to sell assets without Movants' consent. Movants provided no support for this position which directly contradicted the terms of the CLO Agreements; and was filed notwithstanding the Protocols which governed such sales. Movants requested an emergency hearing on this motion [D.I. 1523].	The motion was denied [D.I. 1605] and was characterized as "frivolous."	N/A
-----------------	-------------------	--	---	-----

* The following is by way of summary only and does not include discovery disputes or similar matters. Nothing herein shall be deemed or considered a waiver of any rights or an admission of fact. The Debtor reserves all rights that it may have whether in law or in equity.

12/23/20 ***Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with HarbourVest (Claim Nos. 143, 147, 150, 153, 154) and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith [D.I. 1625]***

Objectors:	Dondero [D.I. 1697] Trusts [D.I. 1706] CLOH [D.I. 1707]	The HarbourVest Entities asserted claims in excess of \$300 million in connection with an investment in a fund indirectly managed by the Debtor for, among other things, fraud and fraudulent inducement, concealment, and misrepresentation. Debtor settled for an allowed Class 8 claim of \$45 million and an allowed Class 9 claim of \$35 million. Dondero and the Trusts alleged that the settlement was unreasonable; was a windfall to the HarbourVest Entities; and constituted vote buying. CLOH argued that the settlement could not be effectuated under the operative documents.	CLOH withdrew its objection at the hearing. The settlement was approved and the remaining objections were overruled [D.I. 1788].	The Trusts appealed [D.I. 1870], and the appeal has been briefed. CLOH recently filed a complaint alleging, among other things, that the settlement was a breach of fiduciary duty and a RICO violation.
-------------------	--	---	--	--

1/14/21 ***Motion to Appoint Examiner Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 1104(c) [D.I. 1752]***

Movants:	Trusts Dondero [D.I. 1756]	Movants sought the appointment of an examiner 14 months after the Petition Date and commencement of Plan solicitation to assess the legitimacy of the claims against the various Dondero Entities and to avoid litigation. Movants requested an emergency hearing on this motion [D.I. 1748].	The motion was denied [D.I. 1960].	N/A
-----------------	----------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-----

1/20/21 ***James Dondero's Objection to Debtor's Proposed Assumption of Executory Contracts and Cure Amounts Proposed in Connection Therewith [D.I. 1784]***

Objector:	Dondero	Dondero objected to the Debtor's proposed assumption of the limited partnership agreement governing the Debtor and MSCF [D.I. 1719].	Dondero withdrew his objection [D.I. 1876] after forcing the Debtor to incur the expense of responding (which included a statement that the Debtor limited partnership agreement was not being assumed).	N/A
------------------	---------	--	--	-----

1/22/20 **Objections to Fifth Amended Plan of Reorganization [D.I. 1472]**

Objectors: ¹ Dondero Trusts [D.I. 1661] [D.I. 1667] Advisors & Senior Funds ² [D.I. Employees 1670] [D.I. 1669] HCRE [D.I. CLOH 1673] [D.I. 1675] NexBank Entities [D.I. 1676]	All objections to the Plan were consensually resolved prior to the confirmation hearing except for the objections of the Dondero Entities and the U.S. Trustee. The U.S. Trustee did not press its objection at confirmation.	All objections were overruled and the Confirmation Order was entered. The Confirmation Order specifically found that Mr. Dondero would “burn the place down” if his case resolution plan was not accepted.	Dondero, the Trusts, the Advisors, and the Funds appealed [D.I. 1957, 1966, 1970, 1972]. The appeal is being briefed.
--	---	--	---

1/24/21 **Application for Allowance of Administrative Expense Claim [D.I. 1826]**

Movants: Advisors	The Advisors seek an administrative expense claim for approximately \$14 million they allege they overpaid to the Debtor during the bankruptcy case under the Shared Services Agreement. Notably, the Advisors have not paid \$14 million to the Debtor during the bankruptcy.	This matter is currently being litigated.	N/A
--------------------------	--	---	-----

2/3/21 **NexBank’s Application for Allowance of Administrative Expense Claim [D.I. 1888]**

Movant: NexBank	NexBank seeks an administrative expense claim for reimbursement of \$2.5 million paid to the Debtor under its Shared Services Agreement and investment advisory agreement. NexBank alleges that it did not receive the services.	This matter is currently being litigated.	N/A
------------------------	--	---	-----

¹ In addition to the Dondero Entities’ objections, the following objections were filed: State Taxing Authorities [D.I. 1662]; Former Employees [D.I. 1666]; IRS [D.I. 1668]; US Trustee [D.I. 1671]; Daugherty [D.I. 1678]. These objections were either resolved prior to confirmation or not pressed at confirmation.

² In addition to the Funds, this objection was joined by: Highland Fixed Income Fund, Highland Funds I and its series, Highland Funds II and its series, Highland Healthcare Opportunities Fund, Highland Merger Arbitrate Fund, Highland Opportunistic Credit Fund, Highland Small-Cap Equity Fund, Highland Socially Responsible Equity Fund, Highland Total Return Fund, Highland/iBoxx Senior Loan ETF, NexPoint Real Estate Strategies Fund, NexPoint Real Estate Finance Inc., NexPoint Real Estate Capital, LLC, NexPoint Residential Trust, Inc., NexPoint Hospitality Trust, NexPoint Real Estate Partners, LLC, NexPoint Multifamily Capital Trust, Inc., VineBrook Homes Trust, Inc., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors II, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors III, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors IV, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors V, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors VI, L.P., NexPoint Real Estate Advisors VII, L.P., and NexPoint Real Estate Advisors VIII, L.P. [D.I. 1677].

2/8/21	<u>James Dondero Motion for Status Conference [D.I. 1914]</u>			
Movant:	Dondero	Dondero requested a chambers conference to convince the Court to delay confirmation of the Plan to allow for continued negotiation of the “pot plan.”	The request was denied [D.I. 1929] after the Debtor and Committee informally objected.	N/A.
2/28/21	<u>Motions for Stay Pending Appeal</u>			
Movants:		The only parties requesting a stay pending appeal were the Dondero Entities. They alleged a number of potential harms to the Dondero Entities if a stay was not granted and offered to post a \$1 million bond.	Relief was denied [D.I. 2084, 2095] and a number of the Movants’ arguments were found to be frivolous.	Movants sought a stay pending appeal from this Court.
	Dondero [D.I. 1973]	Advisors [D.I. 1955]		
	Funds [D.I. 1967]	Trusts [D.I. 1971]		
3/18/21	<u>James Dondero, Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P., NexPoint Advisors, L.P., The Dugaboy Investment Trust, The Get Good Trust, and NexPoint Real Estate Partners, LLC, f/k/a HCRE Partners, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company’s Motion to Recuse Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 455 [D.I. 2060]</u>			
Movants:	Dondero Advisors Trusts HCRE	Dondero argued that Judge Jernigan should recuse herself as her rulings against him and his related entities were evidence of her bias.	Judge Jernigan denied the motion without briefing from any other party on March 23, 2021 [D.I. 2083].	The Movants appealed [D.I. 2149]. The opening brief and the Debtor’s response have been filed.
4/15/21	<u>Debtor’s Motion for Entry of an Order Approving Settlement with UBS Securities LLC and UBS AG London Branch and Authorizing Actions Consistent Therewith [D.I. 2199]</u>			
Movants:	Debtor	UBS Securities LLC and UBS AG London Branch (collectively, “UBS”) asserted claims against the Debtor in excess of \$1 billion arising from two Debtor-managed funds’ breach of contract in 2008. The settlement resolved ten plus years of litigation but had to be renegotiated when the Debtor discovered that the Dondero-controlled Debtor had caused the funds to transfer cash and securities with a face amount of over \$300 million to a Cayman-based Dondero controlled entity in 2017, presumably to thwart UBS’s ability to collect on its judgment.	The only parties to object were Dondero [D.I. 2295] and Dugaboy [D.I. 2268, 2293]. The Debtor filed an omnibus reply on May 14, 2021 [D.I. 2308]. UBS also filed a reply [D.I. 2310]. The UBS settlement was approved on May 24, 2021 [D.I. 2389].	The objectors appealed the settlement.

4/23/21 ***Debtor's Motion for an Order Requiring the Violators to Show Cause Why They Should Not Be Held in Civil Contempt for Violating Two Court Orders [D.I. 2247]***

Movants:	Debtor	Debtor filed a motion seeking an order to show cause as to why Dondero, CLOH, DAF, and their counsel should not be held in contempt of court for willingly violating two final Bankruptcy Court orders. The Bankruptcy Court entered an order to show cause on April 29, 2021 [D.I. 2255] and set an in-person hearing for June 8, 2021.	Dondero, CLOH, the DAF, Mark Patrick (allegedly the person in control of the DAF), and their counsel filed responses to the order to show cause on May 14, 2021 [D.I. 2309, 2312, 2313]. The Debtor filed its reply on May 21, 2021 [D.I. 2350]. On August 4, 2021, the Court found each of Dondero, CLOH, the DAF, Patrick, and Sbaiti & Co. in contempt of court [D.I. 2660]	Dondero has appealed [D.I. 2712]
-----------------	--------	--	--	----------------------------------

4/23/21 ***Motion for Modification of Order Authorizing Appointment of James P. Seery, Jr. Due to Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction [D.I. 2242]***

Movants:	Debtor	DAF and CLOH filed a motion asking the Bankruptcy Court to modify the July 16, 2020, order appointing Seery as the Debtor's CEO/CRO alleging the Bankruptcy Court lacked subject matter jurisdiction.	On May 14, 2021, the Debtor filed a response [D.I. 2311] stating that DAF and CLOH's motion was a collateral attack and barred by res judicata, among other things. The Committee joined in the Debtor's response [D.I. 2315]. DAF and CLOH filed their reply on May 21, 2021 [D.I. 2347]. The Motion was denied on June 25, 2021 [D.I. 2506]	DAF and CLOH have appealed. [D.I. 2513] but are seeking to stay the appeal and the filing of their opening brief.
-----------------	--------	---	---	---

4/20/21 ***Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order (i) Authorizing the Debtor to (a) Enter into Exit Financing Agreement in Aid of Confirmed Chapter 11 Plan and (b) Incur and Pay Related Fees and Expenses and (ii) Granting Related Relief [D.I. 2229]***

Movants:	Debtor	The Debtor filed a motion seeking authority to enter into an exit financing facility. The facility was required, in part, to fund the increased costs to the estate from Dondero's litigiousness. Dugaboy filed two objections to the motion alleging, among other things, that there was no basis for the financing [D.I. 2403; 2467]	The motion was granted on June 30 [D.I. 2503]	N/A
-----------------	--------	--	---	-----

4/29/21 **Motion to Compel Compliance with Bankruptcy Rule 2015.3 [D.I. 2256]**

Movants: Trusts	The Trusts filed a motion on negative notice seeking to compel the Debtor to file certain reports under Rule 2015.3 [D.I. 2256]. The Debtor opposed that motion on May 20, 2021 [D.I. 2341], which was joined by the Committee [D.I. 2343]. The Trusts filed their reply on June 8, 2021 [D.I. 2424]	A hearing was held on June 10, 2021 [D.I. 2442] and the motion was adjourned. The motion was denied as moot on September 7, 2021 [D.I. 2812]	The Trusts appealed [D.I. 2840]
------------------------	--	--	---------------------------------

6/25/21 **Debtor's Motion for Entry of an Order (i) Authorizing the (a) Creation of an Indemnity Subtrust and (b) entry into an Indemnity Trust Agreement and (ii) Granting Related Relief [D.I. 2491]**

Movants: Debtor	The Debtor filed a motion seeking authority to create an indemnity trust to secure the Reorganized Debtor, Claimant Trust, and Litigation Trust's indemnification obligations [D.I. 2491]. Dondero, HCMFA, NPA, and Dugaboy objected [D.I. 2563] arguing that it constituted an improper plan modification. The Debtor and the Committee filed replies in support [D.I. 2576, 2577]	A hearing was held and the Debtor's motion was granted [D.I. 2599].	Dondero, HCMFA, NPA, and Dugaboy appealed [D.I. 2673]
------------------------	---	---	---

8/3/21 **James Dondero's First Amended Motion for Entry of an Order (i) Compelling Mediation and (ii) Granting Related Relief [D.I. 2657]**

Movants: Dondero	Dondero filed a motion to compel mediation nearly six months after confirmation of the Debtor's plan [D.I. 2657]. The Debtor filed a response setting forth certain conditions for the appointment of a mediator [D.I. 2756].	Dondero withdrew his motion to compel mediation after reviewing the Debtor's conditions [D.I. 2763]	N/A
-------------------------	---	---	-----

Highland Capital Management, L.P. v. James D. Dondero, Adv. Proc. No. 20-03190-sgj (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)

12/7/20 **Plaintiff Highland Capital Management, L.P.'s Emergency Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction against Mr. James Dondero [D.I. 2]**

Movant: Debtor	The Debtor commenced an adversary proceeding seeking an injunction against Dondero. Dondero actively interfered with the management of the estate. Seery had instructed Debtor employees to sell certain securities on behalf of the CLOs. Dondero disagreed with Seery's direction and intervened to prevent these sales from being executed. Dondero also threatened Seery via text message and sent threatening emails to other Debtor employees.	A TRO was entered on December 10 [D.I. 10], which prohibited Dondero from, among other things, interfering with the Debtor's estate and communicating with Debtor employees unless it related to the Shared Services Agreements. A preliminary injunction was entered on January 12 after an exhaustive evidentiary hearing [D.I. 59]. This matter was resolved consensually by order entered	Dondero appealed to the District Court, which declined to hear the interlocutory appeal. Dondero is seeking a writ of mandamus from the Fifth Circuit. The writ of mandamus was withdrawn as part of the settlement.
-----------------------	--	---	--

May 18, 2021 [D.I. 182], which enjoined Dondero from certain conduct until the close of the Bankruptcy Case.

1/7/21 ***Plaintiff's Motion for an Order Requiring Mr. James Dondero to Show Cause Why He Should Not Be Held in Civil Contempt for Violating the TRO [D.I. 48]***

Movant: Debtor

In late December, the Debtor discovered that Dondero had violated the TRO in multiple ways, including by destroying his cell phone, his text messages, and conspiring with the Debtor's then general counsel and assistant general counsel³ to coordinate offensive litigation against the Debtor. The hearing on this matter was delayed and there was litigation on evidentiary issues, among other things. An extensive evidentiary hearing was held on March 22.

The Court entered an order Mr. Dondero has finding Mr. Dondero in appealed [D.I. 212] contempt of court on June 7, 2021 [D.I. 190]

³ As a result of this conduct, among other things, the Debtor terminated its general counsel and assistant general counsel for cause on January 5, 2021.

Highland Capital Management, L.P. v. Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P., NexPoint Advisors, L.P., Highland Income Fund, NexPoint Strategic Opportunities Fund, NexPoint Capital, Inc., and CLO Holdco, Ltd., Adv. Proc. No. 21-03000-sgj (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)

1/6/21 ***Plaintiff's Emergency Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction Against Certain Entities Owned and/or Controlled by Mr. James Dondero [D.I. 2]***

<p>Movant: Debtor</p>	<p>In late December, the Debtor received a number of threatening letters from the Funds, the Advisors, and CLOH regarding the Debtor's management of the CLOs. These letters reiterated the arguments made by these parties in their motion filed on December 8, which the Court concluded were "frivolous." The relief requested by the Debtor was necessary to prevent the Funds, Advisors, and CLOH's improper interference in the Debtor's management of its estate.</p>	<p>The parties agreed to the entry of a temporary restraining order on January 13 [D.I. 20]. A hearing on a preliminary injunction began on January 26 and was continued to May 7. The TRO was further extended with the parties' consent [D.I. 64]. The Debtor reached an agreement with CLOH and dismissed CLOH from the adversary proceeding. The Debtor has reached an agreement in principle with the Funds and Advisors that settled this matter, and filed its 9019 motion.</p>
------------------------------	--	--

Highland Capital Management, L.P. v. Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P. and NexPoint Advisors, L.P., Adv. Proc. No. 21-03010-sgj (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)

2/17/21 ***Debtor's Emergency Motion for a Mandatory Injunction Requiring the Advisors to Adopt and Implement a Plan for the Transition of Services by February 28, 2021 [D.I. 2]***

<p>Movant: Debtor</p>	<p>The Debtor's Plan called for a substantial reduction in its work force. As part of this process, the Debtor terminated the Shared Services Agreements and began negotiating a transition plan with the Advisors that would enable them to continue providing services to the retail funds they managed without interruption. The Debtor was led to believe that without the Debtor's assistance the Advisors would not be able to provide services to their retail funds, and, although the Debtor had proceed appropriately, the Debtor was concerned it would be brought into any action brought by the SEC against the Advisors if they could not service the funds.</p>	<p>At a daylong hearing, the Advisors testified that they had a transition plan in place. An order was entered on February 24 [D.I. 25] making factual findings and ruling that the injunction was moot. The parties recently entered into a stipulation regarding discovery for the remaining breach of contract claim. This action was consolidated with the Advisors'</p>
------------------------------	--	--

The Debtor brought this action to force the Advisors to admin claim since both matters
formulate a transition plan and to avoid exposure to the arise from Shared Services
SEC, among others. Agreements.

Highland Capital Management, L.P. v. James Dondero, Adv. Proc. No. 21-03003-sgj (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)

1/22/21 Complaint for (i) Breach of Contract and (ii) Turnover of Property of the Debtor's Estate [D.I. 1]

Movant:	Debtor	Dondero borrowed \$8.825 million from Debtor pursuant to a demand note. Dondero did not pay when the note was called and the Debtor was forced to file an adversary. Dondero subsequently amended his answer to add a series of affirmative defenses, including that the notes had been forgiven because of an undocumented oral agreement with Dondero's sister.	The parties are currently N/A conducting discovery and engaging in motion practice. The parties entered into a global revised scheduling agreement for all five notes litigations.
----------------	--------	---	---

4/15/21 James Dondero's Motion and Memorandum of Law in Support to Withdraw the Reference [D.I. 21]

Movant:	Dondero	Three months after the complaint was filed Dondero filed a motion to withdraw the bankruptcy reference and a motion to stay the adversary pending resolution of his motion [D.I. 22].	A hearing was held on May 25, N/A 2021, and a stay was granted until mid-July 2021. The Court transmitted a report and recommendation on July 7 [D.I. 69]. Dondero filed a limited objection to the R&R.
----------------	---------	---	--

Highland Capital Management, L.P. v. Highland Capital Management Fund Advisors, L.P., Adv. Proc. No. 21-03004-sgj (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)

1/22/21 Complaint for (i) Breach of Contract and (ii) Turnover of Property of the Debtor's Estate [D.I. 1]

Movant:	Debtor	HCMFA borrowed \$7.4 million from Debtor pursuant to a demand note. Dondero did not pay when the note was called and the Debtor was forced to file an adversary. HCMFA subsequently amended its answer to add a series of affirmative defenses, including that the notes had been forgiven because of an undocumented oral agreement between Dondero and his sister.	The parties are currently N/A conducting discovery and engaging in motion practice. The parties entered into a global revised scheduling agreement for all five notes litigations.
----------------	--------	--	---

4/13/21 **Defendants Motion to Withdraw the Reference [D.I. 20]**

Movant:	HCMFA	Three months after the complaint was filed HCMFA filed a motion to withdraw the bankruptcy reference.	A hearing was held on May 25, 2021. The Court transmitted a R&R on July 9 [D.I. 52]. HCMFA filed a limited objection to the R&R.	N/A
----------------	-------	---	--	-----

Highland Capital Management, L.P. v. NexPoint Advisors, L.P., Adv. Proc. No. 21-03005-sgj (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)

1/22/21 **Complaint for (i) Breach of Contract and (ii) Turnover of Property of the Debtor's Estate [D.I. 1]**

Movant:	Debtor	NPA borrowed approximately \$30.75 million under an installment note. NPA did not pay the note when and the Debtor was forced to file an adversary. NPA subsequently amended its answer to add a series of affirmative defenses, including that the notes had been forgiven because of an undocumented oral agreement between Dondero and his sister.	The parties are currently conducting discovery and engaging in motion practice. The parties entered into a global revised scheduling agreement for all five notes litigations.	N/A
----------------	--------	---	--	-----

4/13/21 **Defendants Motion to Withdraw the Reference [D.I. 19]**

Movant:	NPA	Three months after the complaint was filed HCMFA filed a motion to withdraw the bankruptcy reference.	A hearing was held on May 25, 2021. The Court transmitted a R&R on July 9 [D.I. 42]. NPA filed a limited objection to the R&R. The District Court adopted the R&R. [D. Ct. D.I. 10].	N/A
----------------	-----	---	--	-----

Highland Capital Management, L.P. v. Highland Capital Management Services, Inc., Adv. Proc. No. 21-03006-sgj (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)

1/22/21 Complaint for (i) Breach of Contract and (ii) Turnover of Property of the Debtor's Estate [D.I. 1]

Movant:	Debtor	Highland Capital Management Services, Inc. ("HCMS"), borrowed \$900,000 in demand notes and approximately \$20.5 million in installment notes. HCMS did not pay the notes when due and the Debtor was forced to file an adversary. HCMS subsequently amended its answer to add a series of affirmative defenses, including that the notes had been forgiven because of an undocumented oral agreement between Dondero and his sister.	The parties are currently conducting discovery and engaging in motion practice. The parties entered into a global revised scheduling agreement for all five notes litigations.	N/A
----------------	--------	---	--	-----

6/3/21 Defendants Motion to Withdraw the Reference [D.I. 19]

Movant	HCMS	Five months after the complaint was filed HCMS filed a motion to withdraw the reference.	A hearing was held on July 8, 2021. The Court issued its R&R on July 15, 2021 [D. I. 52]. HCMS filed a limited objection to the R&R. the District Court adopted the R&R. [D. Ct. Docket No. 5]. HCMS filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the District Court's Order adopting R&R [D. Ct. Docket No. 8].
---------------	------	--	---

Highland Capital Management, L.P. v. HCRE Partners, LLC (n/k/a NexPoint Real Estate Partners, LLC), Adv. Proc. No. 21-03007-sgj (Bankr. N.D. Tex.)

1/22/21 Complaint for (i) Breach of Contract and (ii) Turnover of Property of the Debtor's Estate [D.I. 1]

Movant:	Debtor	HCRE borrowed \$4.25 million in demand notes and approximately \$6.05 million in installment notes. HCRE did not pay the notes when due and the Debtor was forced to file an adversary. HCRE subsequently amended its answer to add a series of affirmative defenses, including that the notes had been forgiven because of an undocumented oral agreement between Dondero and his sister.	The parties are currently conducting discovery and engaging in motion practice. The parties entered into a global revised scheduling agreement for all five notes litigations.	N/A
----------------	--------	--	--	-----

6/3/21 Defendants Motion to Withdraw the Reference [D.I. 20]

Movant	HCMS	Five months after the complaint was filed HCMS filed a motion to withdraw the reference.	A hearing was held on July 8, 2021. The Court issued its R&R on July 15, 2021 [D.I. 47]. HCRE filed a limited objection to the R&R [D. Ct. Docket No. 5].
---------------	------	--	---

Charitable DAF Fund, L.P., and CLO Holdco, Ltd., v. Highland Capital Management, L.P., Highland HCF Advisor, Ltd., and Highland CLO Funding, Ltd., Case No. 21-cv-00842-B (N.D. Tex. April 12, 2021)

4/12/21 **Original Complaint**

Movants:	DAF CLOH	Movants allege that the Debtor and Seery violated SEC rules, breached fiduciary duties, engaged in self-dealing, and violated RICO in connection with its settlement with the HarbourVest Entities. The Movants brought this complaint despite CLOH having objected to the HarbourVest settlement; never raised this issue; and withdrawn its objection. The Debtor believes the complaint is frivolous and represents a collateral attack on the order approving the HarbourVest settlement. The Debtor will take all appropriate actions.	On May 19, the Debtor filed a motion to enforce the order of reference seeking to have the case referred to the Bankruptcy Court [D.I. 22]. On May 27, 2019, the Debtor filed a motion to dismiss the complaint [D.I. 26]. Briefing was completed for both motions. After briefing was completed, CLOH and the DAF filed a motion seeking to stay the proceeding pending resolution of the appeal of the confirmation order [D.I. 55] and the Debtor filed a responsive brief.	the Court entered an order enforcing the reference on September 20, 2021 [D.I. 64],a and this matter is proceeding in the Bankruptcy Court.
-----------------	-------------	---	--	---

4/19/21 **Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File First Amended Complaint in the District Court**

Movants:	DAF CLOH	Movants filed a motion seeking leave from this Court to add Seery as a defendant and to seek, in this Court, a reconsideration of two final Bankruptcy Court orders.	This Court denied the motion but with leave to refile.	N/A
-----------------	-------------	--	--	-----

PCMG Trading Partners XXIII, L.P. v. Highland Capital Management, L.P., Case No. 21-cv-01169-N (N.D. Tex. May 21, 2021)

4/12/21 Original Complaint

Movants: PCMG Trading Partners XXIII, L.P.	Movants allege that the Debtor violated SEC rules and breached fiduciary duties by causing one of its managed investment vehicles to sell certain assets. The Movant is an entity owned and controlled by Dondero, which had less than a 0.05% interest in the investment vehicle at issue and is no longer an investor. The Debtor believes the complaint is frivolous. The Debtor will take all appropriate actions.	The Complaint was recently filed and the Debtor has not yet been served. Although the Complaint was not served, the movant filed a motion to stay on August 26, 2021 pending the appeal of the confirmation order [D.I. 6].
---	--	---

The Dugaboy Investment Trust v. Highland Capital Management, L.P., Case No. 21-cv-01479-S (N.D. Tex. June 23, 2021)

6/23/21 Original Complaint

Movants: Dugaboy	Dugaboy alleges that the Debtor violated SEC rules and breached fiduciary duties by causing one of its managed investment vehicles to sell certain assets. Dugaboy is Dondero's family trust with less than a 2% interest in the vehicle. Dugaboy's allegations in the complaint are duplicative of allegations it made in proofs of claim filed in the Bankruptcy Court.	The Complaint was withdrawn after the Debtor informed the Bankruptcy Court of the filing.
-------------------------	---	---

The Charitable DAF Fund, LP v. Highland Capital Management, L.P., Case No. 21-cv-01710-N (N.D. Tex. July 22, 2021)

7/22/21 Original Complaint

Movants: Dugaboy	DAF alleges that the Debtor violated SEC rules and breached fiduciary duties by causing one of its managed investment vehicles to sell certain assets. DAF's allegations in the complaint are duplicative of allegations Dugaboy made in proofs of claim filed in the Bankruptcy Court and in its complaint filed in the Northern District of Texas.	The Complaint was recently filed and the Debtor has not yet been served. Although the Complaint was not served, the movant filed a motion to stay on August 26, 2021 pending the appeal of the confirmation order [D.I. 6].
-------------------------	--	---

In re James Dondero, Petitioner, Cause No. DC-21-09534 (Tex. July 22, 2021)

7/22/21 Original Complaint

Movants: Dondero	Dondero seeks pre-suit discovery from Farallon Capital, a purchaser of certain claims in this case, and the Crusader Fund. Dondero alleges that Farallon breached certain U.S. Trustee requirements when it purchased those claims. Dondero also alleges that Farallon purchased those claims because of its relationship to Mr. Seery and that Mr. Seery was leveraging his relationship with Farallon to ensure that he remains in control of the Debtor.	Farallon and the Crusader Fund removed this action to the Bankruptcy Court [D.I. 1]. Dondero moved to remand [D.I. 4], which is being opposed.	This matter is currently being litigated.
-------------------------	---	--	---